The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin

VOLUME X No. 2—PAGES 65–112

Managing-Editor

OREN HULING BAKER

Business Manager

GLENN BLACKMER EWELL

DECEMBER, 1937

¶ Published nine times each year, in September, October, November, December, January, February, March, April, and May, by the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York, at Rochester, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter April 11, 1913, at the post-office at Rochester, N. Y., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 30, 1930.

¶ Copyrighted by the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York.

Crucifixion

I hear a cry of anguish in the East.
The bulbul sings no more, the ponds are red
Where lily pads and lotus made a feast
For eyes that now are lifeless, cold and dead.
Great waves of death roll on the Yangtze tide
While lust of war lords generates new strife,
Though countless millions have already died,
What means such loss in terms of Yellow Life?
Li Po, who knew the beauties of Cathay
And sang of them in proud, immortal verse,
Would feel this couplet in his heart today
Were he alive to speak the deadly curse:

"O Christian World! this cannot be denied,
No race by its own hand is crucified."

—A. Douglas Rugh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Baptist Theological Education in New York State —A Genetic Survey - - - - - - - - 69
Glenn Blackmer Ewell

Rhode Island and Democracy - - - - - - - 83
Orrin Bishop Judd

The Communion of Saints - - - - - - - - 94
Henry Burke Robins

Books of Interest to Ministers - - - - - 106
By Members of the Faculty

He Lived A Life

What was his creed?
I do not know his creed, I only know
That here below, he walked the common road
And lifted many a load, lightened the task,
Brightened the day for others toiling on a weary way:
This, his only creed; I do not know his creed.

What was his creed? I never heard him speak
Of visions rapturous, of Alpine peak
Of doctrine, dogma, new or old;
But this I know, he was forever bold
To stand alone, to face the challenge of each day,
And live the truth, so far as he could see—
The truth that evermore makes free.

His creed? I care not what his creed;
Enough that never yielded he to greed,
But served a brother in his daily need;
Plucked many a thorn and planted many a flower;
Glorified the service of each hour;
Had faith in God, himself, and fellow-men;—
Perchance he never thought in terms of creed,
I only know he lived a life, in deed!

—H. N. Fifer

BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN NEW YORK STATE*

A GENETIC SURVEY

GLENN BLACKMER EWELL

To New York State Baptists two important dates in the story of theological education are April 15, 1817, when a Baptist Theological Seminary to be located in New York City was incorporated by the New York Legislature, and September 24, 1817, when in the home of Deacon Jonathan Olmstead in Hamilton village, there was organized the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York. The history of these two Baptist educational institutions in the same state is a story that needs to be told. Fortunately the original secretary's minutes of both societies are preserved, the one in the Samuel Colgate Baptist Historical Collection at Hamilton, and the other in the Ambrose Swasey Library of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. From these and from contemporary letters, the tale can be reconstructed with a considerable degree of historical accuracy. In a very real sense, the projected Baptist Theological Seminary in New York City, although a phantom, was a direct ancestor of this present Divinity School.

The first entry in the minutes of the New York group is dated March 8, 1813, and includes the following in a resolution—

> "Whereas an Education Society has been formed in the city of Philadelphia, denominated the Baptist Education Society of the Middle States of North America, for the purpose of assisting pious young men, who may possess gifts approved by their respective churches, calculated for the ministry of the gospel, in order to acquire such knowledge as may render them more useful and acceptable; and those of us in the City of New York subscribers thereunto, (four of whom have been elected trustees of said institution) being convinced of the promising utility of such a Seminary, DO hereby form ourselves into a Union (under the name of the Board of Correspondence) to assist the said Seminary in Philadelphia."

Ten other resolutions were adopted dealing with specific details of organization. Mr. William Colgate, senior member of the firm of Colgate & Co., soap makers, of No. 6 Dutch Street, "second door

* This article is a part of the address delivered at the public opening of the Divinity School September 21, 1937.

from the corner of John St.," was one of those present at the meeting, but was not elected a member of the Board. However it is highly significant that he was associated with the movement from its very beginning.

The second meeting was held ten days later, at 149 Broadway. A circular letter was issued in which the following sentences occur—

> "That there are some of our denomination who discountenance the idea of ministerial education is not to be questioned . . . older ministers have deeply lamented the lack of opportunity for education . . . the learning of Gill, Booth, Manning, Hart, Stillman and many others has been highly esteemed. . . . Why not educate young men? . . . We have two young men of grace and talent whom we expect to send to Philadelphia under Dr. Staughton the present tutor." [1]

The third meeting was held April 22nd, at which Mr. William Charles Summers was approved as the first beneficiary; the fourth on May 6th, at which another student was accepted, and $200.00 voted to the Philadelphia Society; the fifth on June 16th when a beneficiary from Utica, N. Y. was received; and the sixth (the final one for the first year) heard the report of the annual meeting of the Society of Philadelphia, and voted

> "to appropriate $100.00 per annum to each student for fuel, washing, clothes and candles."

It was announced also that the students had made very great progress in Latin, geography, and logic, and that they submitted weekly samples of their composition. They voted to send $300.00 more to Philadelphia.

1814

The next year, 1814, only two meetings were held; at the second—June 9th—it was said that there were then five students in the school, three from New York, one from Baltimore, and one from Philadelphia. The New York Board had collected and disbursed $836.00 in 16 months.

1815

The third year again only two meetings occurred. At the January meeting the Treasurer reported that the funds in his hands were too small to remit to the parent society, and it was urged to seek funds

[1] Then pastor of the First Baptist Church of that city.

in other cities "to prevent the institution from sinking"; in July $153.87\frac{1}{2}$ was sent.

1816

Eighteen hundred sixteen was an important year, five meetings being held. On January 15th announcement was made that Capt. Elijah Hunter, one of the original members of the Committee of Correspondence, had died and bequeathed $1,000.00 to the Committee, which the Board invested in an unfortunate mortgage on a farm on Staten Island; on April 29th, "Brother John M. Peck (a name later to become famous in Baptist history) was received as a beneficiary for 6 months"; in July $100.00 was sent to Philadelphia; and in August a momentous decision was reached when it was

"RESOLVED, that the Board be incorporated according to law."

The second Treasurer's report, covering a little less than 16 months, showed receipts of $435.31, and a balance of $113.47.

The meeting of November 11th was the first designated as a meeting of the Board of the Baptist Theological Seminary. Mr. William Colgate was appointed on a committee to solicit funds. They voted

> "that for the present and until the Seminary shall be opened for teaching . . . funds shall be sent to Philadelphia."

1817

The fifth year saw only three meetings in New York. At the first, July 14th, the act of Incorporation was read, and Trustee Withington signified his desire to donate $1,000.00 to the Board which was later loaned to Columbian College in Washington.

In November the Board convened to adopt rules and regulations to govern the theological school they still envisioned. They provided for a corporate seal thus—

> "a circular die $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter, having engraven thereon around the lower margin (the words) "BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, STATE OF NEW YORK, and in the center an emblem of an Apostolic Father supporting on his arms the Bible open at the 1st chapter of St. John in the attitude of explaining its precious truths to a group of human figures before him, representing the nations of the earth."

A Board of Trustees was provided, 20 of whom must be members of Particular Baptist churches. They provided for a faculty thus—

> "As soon as funds shall be collected sufficient for endowing this institution, the said Board of Trustees shall proceed to appoint one discreet person, a member of a Particular Baptist Church, eminent in piety, talent, classic and theological learning to be President of the Seminary; and also such other persons of like eminent acquirements to be professors and tutors thereof as they may deem expedient."

The same year, 1817, there appeared in the November issue of the American Baptist Magazine the call for a meeting to be held "at the Baptist meeting house in Hamilton, on the fourth Wednesday in September." Only thirteen men (the four who signed the call and nine others) assembled on September 24th. Because they were so few, the meeting was transferred from the Baptist church to the home of Jonathan Olmstead, one mile south of the village where they organized The Baptist Education Society of the State of New York. The house still stands, and has been restored under the name of The House of the Thirteen, to serve both as a museum and a shrine.

1818

At the beginning of 1818 a letter was received by the New York City Board from Dr. Staughton, of Philadelphia, saying that his duties as Secretary of the Baptist Board for Foreign Missions precluded giving further time to his tutorial duties, and he therefore had resigned. This brought the Board, on February 12th to the adoption of this resolution—

> "Having taken into consideration the present state of the Theological Seminary, the Board are of the opinion that the Institution ought to be located in the State of New York agreeable to our charter from The Honorable, the Legislature of this State."

They voted to remit three hundred dollars to Philadelphia, remarking that this sum constituted "the whole of our funds and twenty dollars over"; they also received the first books of their future library,—a Hebrew Bible, a Hebrew-Latin Dictionary, and a Hebrew Grammar. In June they appointed a librarian, the Reverend Archibald Maclay, the only faculty member ever actually to function. They rented a room at the corner of Pearl Street and Broadway (near the site of the famous Fraunce's Tavern, and the present Stock Exchange building) for two hundred dollars a year, in which to house a Grammar School, and appointed Mr. Daniel H. Barnes, M.A., of Schenectady the principal.

Also on February 12th, Jonathan Wade ended at Hamilton, his long winter trek on foot from Hartford, New York, to present himself as the first beneficiary of the new Baptist Education Society. A bronze tablet has been placed upon the walls of the Hartford Baptist Church to commemorate his educational venture. We can pause in our story long enough to read his record as printed in the 1930 edition of the General Alumni Catalogue of this Divinity School—

> JONATHAN WADE, D.D., born at Otsego, Dec. 10, 1798; graduated 1822; student of the Burnam language 1822–23; ordained at Broadalbin Feb. 23, 1823; missionary of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society to the Karens, Burma, 1823–1872 (49 yrs!) Died Rangoon, Burma, June 10, 1872. *Author,* "Vocabulary of the Sgau Karen Language."

This Divinity School can always be proud of its first student, as well as of all the five members of its first graduating class, that of 1822.

The first annual meeting of the Hamilton Society was held at Sangerfield. At that time they appointed two important committees; one to secure incorporation for the Society; the other to select a site for the projected school.

The following appears in the first report of their Executive Committee:

> "The Education Society formed in the city of New York should at once excite our joy and gratitude. From the local distance of the two Societies we do not anticipate any clashing or interference, but a mutual desire to do each other many kind offices."

1819

Things were not going any too well in New York. In January, 1819, they appointed a committee to attempt to secure financial aid from the State Treasury—a very unBaptistic move! The Committee included the Rev. Charles W. Summers, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Troy (only recently one of the beneficiaries of the Board), and Captain Friend Humphrey, of Albany. With the enlistment of Mr. Humphrey the cause of ministerial education secured a valuable recruit. The same year he was elected a member of the New York Board and served on it until 1837, when he became a trustee of the Hamilton Society serving from 1837, and as vice president from 1839, until 1851, when, as one of those favoring "Removal" he transferred his support to the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education (i. e. the Rochester

"Education" Society) and served as its President from 1851 to 1854, the year of his death. Thus he had been the active friend of Baptist educational enterprises for 35 years, and was one of the important connecting links between the three Baptist Education societies in the State, which have now again become one. By the time of the May meeting the Board had learned that the Legislature—very properly—had refused aid. December 11th there is a note that "the annual meeting had incautiously been allowed to lapse," but one was held eleven days later when both William Colgate and Friend Humphrey were elected trustees.

The Hamilton Society had been incorporated on March 5th, and held its second annual meeting at Whitesborough on June 2nd. The committee on Site reported a disagreement, and asked that another Committee be appointed with full power.

1820

Four meetings were held in New York during 1820, the most significant was on October 16th, when a letter was read from the Society in Hamilton, dated July 29th. On July 14th—fifteen days earlier than the date of the letter—the first beneficiary of the New York Board, Mr. William G. Miller, a member of the Abyssianian Baptist Church, had been received for instruction at Hamilton. This very naturally had raised thoughts as to the advantages to be gained by union of resources and effort, and the first gesture was a letter to New York from the Hamilton Executive Committee.

Some paragraphs from this letter are interesting. In the first they gracefully acknowledged that it was the example of the New York Board that generated the plan "for a school in this region." "Yours was the nearest school to which we could send our young men," they said, and that was from 200 to 400 miles distant from various parts of central and western New York State. Furthermore, they feared the evil effects of sending "young men from the interior, brought up to hard labor, without the advantages of common school education," to New York City. They already had ten or twelve students at Hamilton, who earned some of their support by supplying nearby churches. They regarded this as "beneficial to the health of body and mind." Vermont had considered establishing a Seminary, but had decided to merge with the Hamilton group since Hamilton was about midway between the

Green Mountains and the Niagara River. Agents had already heard in New York suggestions of coalition—"should you eventually decide in favor of the proposed union, please suggest any measures you think proper to adjust to carry it into effect, and every circumstance will be promptly attended to on our part."

The phrase "Yours was the nearest school" could refer only to the Grammar School. The New York students, up to July, had been sent to Philadelphia, while the Hamilton students "have been at Whitesborough and Hamilton, either at an academy or with private instructors." Now one New York beneficiary had been sent to Hamilton, and others were asking to be transferred there from Philadelphia. The Seminary in New York was as yet "a vision glorious." In November Deacon Olmstead went to New York for a conference with the brethren there.

At Hamilton the Literary and Theological Institution was formally opened on May 1st. The citizens of Hamilton had agreed to provide "a suitable building," which they accomplished by adding a third story to the Academy. Here the one professor, the Reverend Daniel Haskell, and the ten students met to initiate a new Baptist educational enterprise.

The next month, at the Third Annual Meeting of the Society, the following report was read and approved—

> "After receiving the report of the Committee appointed to ascertain the most eligible site, the Board . . . on the third of November (1819) decided in favor of Hamilton, on condition that $6,000 be paid to the institution in the following manner; namely, $3,500 to be laid out in a building within four years; and $2,500 to be paid in board at $1.50 per week, in five annual payments; a place for the school was also to be furnished by the first of May. The conditions have been complied with, sureties have been given for the building and board, and a place is already provided for the school."

Six years later the farm of Deacon Samuel Payne, consisting of 123 acres, was purchased by the Society on favorable terms.

During 1821 only two meetings were attempted in New York. At the January meeting no quorum was present; but at the November meeting a faculty for the proposed Seminary was elected, consisting of

Elder John Stanford, M.A., *Professor of Theology*
Daniel H. Barnes, M.A., *Professor of Languages*
Elder Archibald Maclay, M.A., *Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Librarian.*

They appointed a committee to enlarge the library; also an agent to collect funds.

The next year—1822—was one characterized by frequent exchange of letters, and appointment of committees of conference, Messrs. Maclay, Colgate, and Barnes for the New York Board; and Messrs. Kendrick, Joel Clark for the Hamilton Society.

At the Annual Meeting, when this report was read to the meeting of the Executive Committee, the following resolutions were adopted—

> "The principles upon which the Reverend Joel Clark has negotiated a union between this Society and the Baptist Education Society in New York, and the State of Connecticut are such as this Committee most cordially approve. . . .
>
> "Three hundred and fifty dollars have already been received from New York, together with books to the amount of one hundred."

And at the meeting of the Society, the following resolution was adopted—

> "that this Society cordially approve the conduct of the Executive Committee in effecting a union between this Society . . . and the New York Baptist Theological Seminary."

The initiative now seems to have passed to the Hamilton group. In New York, a meeting was held on November 24, 1823, at which a Committee was appointed "to inquire into the immediate wants of our students at Hamilton, and to furnish them such relief as they consider necessary."

The Reverend Joel Clark reported to the May meeting of the Education Society that he had made a tour of Connecticut and New York "to effect a union between the Education Societies in those places and this (i. e. the Hamilton) Society." In his report, under date of March 27th, is this entry—

> Tour to New York. I was received by the members of the board of the Theological Seminary with that respect and affectionate regard which so peculiarly characterizes our brethren in that city. Mr. Barnes, Mr. Maclay and Mr. Colgate had in some degree prepared the way for the union of the two societies; these excellent brethren had pursued such a course in regard to the great and good object to be accomplished, as will ever mark the worth of prudence and wisdom. Took much pains to explain as clearly as I could the object and prospects of this Society, together with

> the economy and regulation of the School; stayed in the city about four weeks. A day or two before I left there, the Board at their meeting in Oliver Street (Baptist Church) unanimously voted to unite with this Society, and to send their funds and students to this institution. . . . Received from their Treasurer in cash $350.00 . . . and a very liberal donation of $130.00 in books.

In April he was in Connecticut with the Board of the Education Society of that state, and reports—

> "At the meeting of the Society it was unanimously voted to unite with this (the Hamilton) Society and send their funds and young brethren to this Institution. . . ."

The Vermont Baptists having previously abandoned their plan, Hamilton became the exclusive center of Baptist ministerial training for the three states of Vermont, Connecticut and New York.

From 1824 the two organizations, the Board in New York and the Education Society in Hamilton, were, to all intents and purposes, one. The New York group kept up their legal existence and retained their charter, but they more and more assumed the function of being a strong financial arm upon which the Hamilton group could lean in time of stress. They should be highly honored for the loyal and generous manner in which they responded to more than annual appeals for aid. Two or three instances will illustrate this.

December 31, 1824, they voted to forward the remaining books they had collected for a library to Hamilton "on loan for the students." Dr. Haskell was present with the Board on March 15, 1826, at which they voted—

> "that, after hearing the interesting and lucid statement . . . we do cordially approve the resolution . . . to erect a new building at Hamilton, for the accommodation of ministering brothers attending theological studies at that place."

and resolved to loan $2,000.00 to the Hamilton Society, to be secured by the collection of the Staten Island mortgage, and the loan to Columbian College. Both anticipations failed, but the New York brethren did not, as we shall see. Fifteen days later, at Hamilton, the Executive Committee voted—

> "that the building Mr. Haskell has agreed to erect for the Society be placed on the farm lately purchased from Deacon Samuel Payne."

Thoroughly modernized, this building is still in use under the name of West College.

In July the Board was told that neither Mr. Fountaine nor Columbian College could pay their indebtedness, and a letter from Hamilton explained the urgent need of money by January first next, as the new building was going up steadily. In September the Board was asked to raise $500.00 at once, and the remaining $500.00 by January first, and as usual, a Committee was appointed. Within two months and two days this excellent Committee reported that they had raised not $500.00 as requested, but had actually remitted to Hamilton $755.00 and that the balance would be ready January first. This was rewarded by the Hamilton Society by a suggestion that they raise an additional $500.00 for the furnishings of the new building. At the same meeting (November 20th) the New York brethren voted to forgive the indebtedness of Columbian College, which at that date amounted to $1,573.20, principal and interest. In July 1827, another thousand dollars had been raised and paid to Hamilton, and the Board voted to raise yet another thousand dollars by a loan, with the dubious Fountaine mortgage and judgment as collateral. This was communicated in a letter dated July 24, 1827 which reads as follows—

N. York, July 24th 1827

Dear Brethren,

The Board of Directors of the N. Y Bapt. Theological Seminary, at a meeting held at the house of the President on Thursday the 19th Inst. unanimously passed the following Resolutions; viz—

1st Resolved that the Sum of $1000 be paid into the hands of Elder N. Kendrick, for the purpose of endowing a Scholarship in the Hamilton The. Seminary, to bear up the name of the late Capt. Elijah Hunter, & to be known as *"The Hunter Scholarship."*

2nd Resolved that the further Sum of $1000, be paid over to the Treasurer of the N. Y. Bap. Education Society on or before June 1st 1828, for the purpose of endowing a Scholarship in the same Seminary, to bear up the name of the late Jn. Withington, & to be designated *"The Withington Scholarship."*

The following conditions are annexed to the endowment of the aforementioned Scholarships.

1. They are to be secured to the N. Y. Bap. Theological Seminary by a mortgage upon the real Estate of the N. Y. Bapt. Education Society.

2. The N. Y. Bap. The. Seminary shall be entitled to the privilege of recommending, from time to time, suitable young ministering Brethren, to enjoy the benefits pertaining to said Scholarships.

3. These Scholarships shall terminate and cease, and the $2000 aforesaid, be returned to the N. Y. Baptist Theological Seminary, within One Year after official notice of the wishes of the Seminary, upon this point, shall have been communicated to the N. Y. Baptist Education Society.

It is proper for me here to remark that in the opinion of the present members of our Board, neither the $2000, nor the portion of our Library loaned to the N. Y. Ed. Socy. will ever be reclaimed; but the provisions of our Charter will not permit us to alienate any part of the property we possess by inheritance, without exposing it at once to the legal claims of the heirs of deceased donors. Besides, it is possible, that in process of time, the System of Theology taguht at Hamilton may not be approved of by the Society, located in this City; & duty, therefore, renders it necessary for us to secure the ultimate controll over the means which God, in his all-wise providence, has confided to our stewardship.

As Elder Kendrick was present at the late meeting of the Board, he will be able to assure you, from what he saw & heard, that it is our ardent desire to bind the two Institutions together by the strong cords of mutual interest of Christian affection.

By order of the Board N. Y. Theological Seminary
S. H. Cone, Ch. S. Com.

In 1828 they borrowed $1,000.00 from the N. Y. Baptist Missionary Society, (i. e. the Baptist State Convention) and sent upstate.

At the meeting of December 10th, 1829, it was reported that since the organization (1818) the Society at Hamilton had received contributions from all sources of $27,673.15, and had visible assets amounting to $15,786.13.

By 1830 the usual thing had happened. It became evident that the loan floated in 1827 to relieve the pressure at Hamilton, could not be repaid without seriously diverting current contributions being sent there, so the six generous Baptist laymen (two of whom were Colgates) performed an act of grace and converted their loans into gifts, amounting with interest to $1,239.12.

In 1832, after a report by Dr. Kendrick, the Board voted that it was their judgment that a second building (East College) should be erected at Hamilton. The plans called for a structure 100 x 56 feet; 4 stories, containing 125 rooms, at an estimated cost of $8,000.00, of which

$6,000.00 was already pledged. The thinly-veiled inference was that the remainder might well come from New York.

On the last day of 1833 Dr. Kendrick was again in New York with the Board. He reported 150 students enrolled, 50 having been received that year; that the course of study had been lengthened to six years (four collegiate; two seminary); that there were seven professors whose combined salaries amounted to $4,400.00; and that "$500.00 had been expended on installing two furnaces for heated air in the new building." It was resolved that "in view of the superior advantages for ministerial education at Hamilton," the Baptists of New York and Brooklyn should raise $3,000.00 for the institution.

During 1834 they borrowed $1,000.00 from the N. Y. Domestic Mission Society, which was paid back to its successor, the American Baptist Home Mission Society. The claim for economical administration at Hamilton was substantiated by the report that the average annual cost for tuition, board, lodging and laundry was $53.80 per student. Clothes were provided in addition, as needed. Also this interesting statement appears—

> "Pious young men of evangelical churches are admissible to its privileges; some students of other denominations are now in the Seminary."

From 1835 to 1838, inclusive, only eight meetings were held in New York, none of them important. On October 23rd, 1838, it is noted that Mr. Orrin B. Judd was received as a beneficiary, with the comment that he was "one of their first students, possessing talents of a high order." His son is Orrin R. Judd, a trustee of this Divinity School, and a grandson, Orrin G. Judd, is now a member of the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society.

Even the enthusiastic young Baptist laymen of the metropolis and faithful "mothers in Israel," became active in the good cause. Let me present two letters on this point.

New York. Oct. 3, 1839

Dear Brethren

I am instructed by the Board of Managers of the Young Mens Education Soc. of New York & Broklyn to open a Correspondence with your institution and to request you to nominate to us about 20 students who are already rec. or are about to be rec. into the Seminary in order that we may select from such a list a suitable number as beneficiaries of our Soc. The Board would give a

preference to those who are pursuing studies with a view to labor in Burmah 2dly to such as are destined to other Foreign fields and 3dly to those whose minds have been led to the Great Western valley of the U. S. Of course we wish those only named to us who are not already adopted as beneficiaries of some other Society. In furnishing this information I will thank you as far as you can to give us an account of the standing of each individual you nominate as regards their piety and literary attainments and promise of usefulness. I will also be pleased to receive any other information respecting the Condition and claims of your valuable institution which may be used by us in promoting the interests. You have doubtless heard ere this of the formation of our Soc. through the Agency of Bros Kendrick and Edmunds. As far as we can judge from present appearance I think you may depend upon it as an active auxiliary. They will hardly do much the first year but will acquire strength and efficiency with their growth.

Hoping to hear from you soon
I am yrs truly
Rob. F. Winslow

70 Elridge Street New York Dec. 23rd 1840

Dear Sir

Having written to you before with respect to two boxes sent by the oliver st sewing society and having received no answer to say weather you received them. If this should reach you, as soon as convenient would you please to answer it. The boxes contained five matts five bols ten pillars three comfortables sixteen prs draws seven canton flanen shirts one piec of black sattinett ten shirts six prs of stockings five vest one pr of pantoloons three quilts four prs of sheets. written in behalf of the oliver st sewing society I remain your ever sincere friend and well wisher in the Gospel of Christ

Rebecca Bennett Secy

In time the group interest in New York practically vanished. Thereafter contacts on behalf of ministerial education were between "agents" appointed by the Education Society, and individual churches as well as generous laymen. The final entry in the Secretary's book of the New York Board is dated February 8, 1848. It is inconclusive as to how, if ever, the corporation was dissolved. There, at least, the documentary history ends.

By this time Baptist-sponsored theological education in New York State was well under way. The next great issue which stirred the denomination from the Niagara frontier to Battery Park was the "Removal Controversy," which finally resulted in the retention at Hamilton

of the two schools already located there, and the establishment at Rochester, in 1850, under Baptist initiative, of the University of Rochester and the Rochester Theological Seminary.

What we hope to be the final chapter was begun in 1926 which records the merging, two years later, of the two Baptist Education societies existing in New York State into one corporation, bearing the name of the older society. Colgate University remains at Hamilton, a lineal descendant of the collegiate department of the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution; the Colgate Theological Seminary, the theological descendant, was merged with the Rochester Theological Seminary, to form the present Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

RHODE ISLAND AND DEMOCRACY

ORRIN BISHOP JUDD *

RHODE ISLAND was first organized as a body politic in 1643, under a charter from Charles I., King of England. In 1655, seven years after the death of Charles I., this patent was reaffirmed by Oliver Cromwell, who was then Protector of the Commonwealth. But in 1663 it was superseded by a new charter from Charles II., under which the government of Rhode Island was thenceforth administered for the space of 180 years, until the adoption of her present constitution in 1843.

Under the former charter her polity was a pure democracy, in which her people were vested, as the instrument itself declares, "with full power and authority, to rule themselves, and such others as should thereafter inhabit within any part of the said tract of land, by such a form of civil government, as, by voluntary consent of all, or the greater part of them, they should find most suitable to their estate and condition."

Under the charter from Charles II., the polity of Rhode Island was an oligarchy, pure and simple; the constituency of which consisted originally not of all the people inhabiting Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, but of twenty-six individuals organized by royal ordination, and declared to be a close and self-perpetuating corporation, vested with full power and authority to govern and control the people at large. This is plainly set forth by His Majesty in the charter itself where he says:

---

* Orrin Bishop Judd, 1816–1892, pastor, editor, writer, and patriot was a capable minister for over a decade, acted some seven years as editor of the *New York Chronicle,* and engaged in literary work and government service for thirty-four years. At the age of thirty-eight, he was honored by Colgate University with the degree of LL.D.

When Dr. Thomas Armitage published his bulky *A History of the Baptists,* in 1887, Dr. Judd found some statements upon pages 722, 643, which he knew to be historically inaccurate. They were: "Roger Williams . . . planted the first free republic of this land . . . a republic of true liberty . . . the freest city and State on earth." Hence he took pen in hand and wrote a *Sketch of Rhode Island.*

Through the courtesy of his son, Mr. Orrin R. Judd, Vice-chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Baptist Education Society of the State of New York, we are able to publish this very valuable study of the true development of democracy in Rhode Island.

The more historically minded reader may be interested in comparing the conclusions of this essay with those of an article upon *The Baptist View of the State* which appeared in *Church History,* March, 1937, pages 24–49. C. H. M.

"Our will and pleasure is, and of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have ordained, constituted, and declared, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do ordain constitute, and declare, that they, the said William Brenton, William Coddington, Nicholas Easton, Benedict Arnold, William Boulston, John Porter, Samuel Gorton, John Smith, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dexter, John Coggeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houldon, John Greene, John Roome, William Dyre, Samuel Wildbore, Richard Tew, William Field, Thomas Harris, James Barker, Rainsborrow, Williams, and John Nickson, and all such others as are now or hereafter shall be, admitted free of the Company and society of our colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England, shall be, from time to time, and forever thereafter, a body corporate and politic, in fact and name, by the name of The Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America; and that by the same name they and their successors shall and may have perpetual succession.

"And further, we will and ordain, and, by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, declare and appoint, that, for the better ordering and managing of the affairs and business of the said Company and their successors, there shall be one Governor, one Deputy Governor, and ten Assistants, to be from time to time constituted, elected and chosen, out of the freemen of the said Company.

"And for the better execution of our royal pleasure herein, we do, for us, our heirs and successors, assign, name, constitute, and appoint the aforesaid Benedict Arnold to be the first and present Governor of the said Company, and the said William Brenton to be the Deputy Governor, and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Coggeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, to be the ten present assistants of the said Company, to continue in the said several offices respectively, until the first Wednesday which shall be in the month of May now next coming. . . . And that forever hereafter, twice in every year, that is to say, on every first Wednesday in the month of May, and on every last Wednesday in October, or oftener, in case it shall be requisite, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company, not exceeding six persons for Newport, four persons for each of the respective towns of Providence, Portsmouth, and Warwick, and two persons for each other place, town or city, who shall be, from time to time, thereunto elected or deputed, by the major part of the freemen of the respective towns or places, for which they shall be so elected or deputed, shall have a general meeting or assembly, then

and there to consult, advise and determine, in and about the affairs and business of the said Company and Plantations.

"And further, we do, of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, give and grant unto the said Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America, and their successors, that the Governor, or, in his absence, or by his permission, the Deputy Governor of the said Company, for the time being the Assistants and such of the freemen of the said Company, as shall be so aforesaid elected or deputed, or so many of them as shall be present at such meeting or assembly, as aforesaid, shall be called the General Assembly; and that they, or the greatest part of them then present, (whereof the Governor, or Deputy Governor, and six of the assistants at least, to be seven,) shall have, and have hereby given and granted unto them, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to appoint, alter and change such days, times, and places of meeting and general assembly, as they shall think fit; and to chose, nominate, and appoint such and so many persons as they shall think fit, and shall be willing to accept the same, to be free of the said Company and body politic, and them into the same to admit; and to elect and constitute such offices and officers, and to grant such needful commissions as they shall think fit and requisite for ordering, managing, and dispatching of the affairs of the said Governor and Company and their successors; and from time to time to make, ordain, constitute and repeal, such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, forms and ceremonies of government and magistracy, as to them shall seem meet, for the good and welfare of the said Company, and for the government and ordering of the lands and hereditaments hereinafter mentioned to be granted, and of the people that do, or at any time thereafter shall, inhabit or be within the same; so as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but (as near as may be) agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England . . . and also to regulate and order the way and manner of all elections to offices and places of trust, and to prescribe, limit, and distinguish the number and bounds of all places, towns and cities, within the limits and bounds hereinafter mentioned, and not herein particularly named, that have, or shall have the power of electing and sending of freemen to the said General Assembly; and also to order, direct, and authorize the imposing of lawful and reasonable fines, mulcts, imprisonment, and executing other punishments, pecuniary and corporal, upon offenders and delinquents, according to the course of other corporations, within this our Kingdom of England. . . . Willing, commanding, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordaining and appointing, that all such laws, statutes,

> orders and ordinances, instructions, impositions and directions as shall be so made by Governor, Deputy, Assistants, and freemen, or such number of them as aforesaid, and published in writing, under their common seal, shall be carefully and duly observed, kept, performed, and put in execution, according to the true intent and meaning of the same."

In accordance with the provisions of the charter from which the foregoing extracts are taken, the General Assembly was convened at Newport, March 1, 1663. About the first thing done at that meeting, after the acceptance of the charter, was the adoption of the following rule:

> "It is the pleasure and appointment of this General Assembly, that none presume to vote in the matter aforesaid, but such whom this General Assembly expressly by their writing shall admit as freemen."

The term "freeman," as used in the royal charter of Rhode Island, denotes one to whom are accorded, by right of inheritance or special preferment, the full privileges and immunities of citizenship, as contra-distinguished from those whose liberties are more or less restricted, and whose franchises are wholly ignored or greatly limited. Wherever such a distinction is made in any community of citizens the privileged class are prone to take advantage of the common people. Rhode Island has furnished no exception to this general rule. The majority of her adult male citizens were precluded from all participation in her government—the very government to which they themselves were necessarily subject; that government was exclusively vested in a select Company, chosen, organized and incorporated by the King of England; no citizen, except those named in the charter granted by him, could become a member of that Company only as he was elected thereunto by the Company; and no one was eligible to membership by such election unless he was a born citizen and freeholder or the eldest son of a freeholder. And the number of naturalized citizens, together with all the nonfreeholders and those kept out by the arbitrary will of the Company, left but a small minority of the adult male citizens, who, with free suffrage, such as now enfranchises the emancipated slaves in every southern state, would have been qualified and entitled to vote; whereas, under the charter of Rhode Island only 9,590 out of 22,674 had the right of suffrage; so that, nearly three-fifths of the adult male citizens of Rhode Island in 1840 were deprived of the right of suffrage by the

maintenance of a government organized under the authority of a charter from Charles II., King of England.

In the meeting at Newport, March 1, 1663, when the Charter of Charles II., was accepted, the General Assembly passed an act in these words:

> "That all men professing Christianity, and of competent estates, and of civil conversation, who acknowledge and are obedient to the civil magistrates, though of different judgments in religious affairs (*Roman Catholics only excepted*), shall be admitted freemen, and shall have liberty to choose and be chosen officers in the Colony, both military and civil."

This appears of record in the first collection of the statutes of Rhode Island, which was prepared by a committee in 1703, and in the digests of 1719, 1731, and 1767, (see Vol. 2, Rhode Island Colonial Records p. 36 and note), and is put beyond all question by an act of the General Assembly, repealing in 1783 the anti-catholic law of 1663, to wit:

> "That all the rights and privileges of the Protestant citizens of this state, as declared in and by an Act made and passed the 1st day of March, A. D. 1663, be, and the same are hereby fully extended to Roman Catholic citizens; and that they, being of competent estates and of civil conversation, and acknowledging and paying obedience to the civil magistrates, shall be admitted freemen, and shall have liberty to choose and be chosen civil or military officers within this State, any exception in the said Act to the contrary notwithstanding." See Col. Records, vol. 9, p. 674.

It is stated by Francis Brinley, as recorded in Holmes's American Annals, vol. I, p. 341, that

> "in 1665 the government and council of Rhode Island, &c., passed an order for outlawing the people called Quakers, because they would not bear arms, and to seize their estates; but the people in general rose up against these severe orders, and would not suffer it."

Hon. Samuel Eddy, for many years Secretary of State in Rhode Island, while he claims that Brinley's statement in reference to the Quakers is "incorrect and partial," admits it to be, after all, substantially true.

In the law of 1663 the possession of "competent estates," is mentioned as one of the precedent conditions upon which a citizen of Rhode Island might become a "freeman." In 1665 the General Assembly adopted

the rule that candidates for freemanship should "possess a competent estate" and be of civil conversation and obedient to the civil magistrate. In 1666 the property qualification was repealed; but in 1723 another similar law was enacted by which every candidate for freemanship, unless he was the eldest son of a freeholder, was required to be himself a freeholder or owner of land, tenements, and hereditaments, to the value of *one hundred pounds.* In 1742 this property condition was increased to *two hundred pounds.* In 1746 it was increased to *four hundred pounds.* In 1760 it was reduced to *forty pounds.* In 1798 it was reduced to *one hundred and thirty-four dollars;* it being in all cases provided that the eldest son of a freeholder should be eligible to freemanship without any property qualification. And yet no man, though the eldest son, and possessed of a "competent estate," could become a freeman invested with the right of suffrage till he was admitted to that high prerogative by a vote of the freemen of the town in which he resided.

It is, indeed, a well-known fact that in 1843, when the royal charter of Charles II. was superseded by the present constitution of Rhode Island, there were many adult male citizens there who possessed "competent estates" and desired to exercise the right of suffrage, but who could not, because they had never been endowed with that privilege by a vote of the freemen in the town where they resided.

In 1873, the Legislature of Rhode Island empowered the city of Providence to take possession of certain private lands under the right of eminent domain. The lands were largely owned and occupied by naturalized citizens, whose freemanship, and consequently their right of suffrage, depended upon their ownership of these "competent estates." But they were forcibly dispossessed; and being thus compulsorily divested of their property qualification to vote, and receiving no compensation for their property so taken from them till the expiration of two years, their names were struck from the voting list, and they were thereby disfranchised without redress. Yet we are told in a "History of the Baptists," that "Rhode Island was the freest state on earth." Prior to 1860 a portion of the town of Pawtucket was within the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, and during that time naturalized citizens, residents therein, voted, like all other citizens of Massachusetts. These were disfranchised by the property qualification required by the Constitution of Rhode Island. Then there was another and greater injustice resulting from that involuntary transition. The population

of Pawtucket in 1860 was about 5,000, of which 1,495 were foreign born, and these were transferred, *nolens volens,* by force of a judicial proceeding and legislative acts, from the jurisdiction of Rhode Island, in which they were deprived of the right of suffrage on account of their foreign birth, although the founder of that state was himself a native of Great Britain.

It was not until 1868 that aliens were entitled to inherit in Rhode Island, the rule of escheat, odious and obsolete as it was, being prevalent there up to that time.

In 1861, immediately after the defeat of the Union army at Bull Run, an attempt was made to extend the elective suffrage to naturalized citizens of Rhode Island who were excluded under the constitution of 1843. At a special session of the General Assembly Senator Potter introduced the following resolution:

> "Aliens who enlist or volunteer in any of the regiments of this state and are honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now, or may hereafter become naturalized citizens of the United States, shall be admitted to vote at all elections held in this state, upon the same terms as native-born citizens of the United States."

This resolution was adopted in the Senate unanimously, in the House by 40 to 7. It met with favor from the press and the people everywhere. The 3rd Rhode Island regiment was organized immediately after this session of the legislature under the pretended leadership of naturalized citizens, and was largely made up of that class. That the assurances given and the promises made in accord with Senator Potter's resolution, then pending, did much to awaken the patriotic loyalty, and arouse the ambitious enthusiasm of the foreign element, was manifest in that, out of 23,457 soldiers who enlisted in Rhode Island regiments, 5,729 about one-fourth of the whole number, were of foreign birth or parentage, exclusive of many who enlisted in regiments of other states and in the navy. Yet Senator Potter's amendment was not approved at the next session of the legislature. But it was again proposed at the August session in 1862, and, after being put through the same routine, it was brought again before the freemen at large in 1863, when it was rejected in a vote of 1,346 to 2,549 presenting the humiliating spectacle of a privileged class in the state alluring their subordinates to fight for the emancipation and enfranchisement of the negro by a delusive promise of giving the same blessing to disfranchised citizens

of their own commonwealth—a promise half-made, half-broken, and from the first altogether impossible for them to fulfill.

It was not till after repeated attempts to enfranchise the foreign-born non-freeman who had fought for the Union in Rhode Island regiments, had been made and failed, that an act was finally passed Nov. 7, 1876, by a popular vote of 11,038 to 10,956, allowing foreign-born soldiers and sailors to vote on the same terms as native-born citizens.

Under the charter of Charles II. there was an inequality in the apportionment of the General Assembly among the different towns, which operated very unjustly. Newport was entitled to six members; Providence, Portsmouth, and Warwick to four each, and all the other towns to two each. Dr. Knowles, in his memoir of Roger Williams, written in 1833, says: "Providence, with 16,000 inhabitants, sends only four representatives to the General Assembly, while Portsmouth, with only 1,700 inhabitants, sends four representatives, and Newport, with 8,000 inhabitants, sends six representatives." The population of the state in 1840 was 108,837. Of these there were, exclusive of aliens, lunatics, paupers, and convicts, 22,694 adult, white, male citizens; and of these only 9,590 were entitled to the right of suffrage under the prevailing rule in Rhode Island. The largest vote ever cast in that state up to 1840 was 8,622. In that year the several cities and towns were entitled to seventy-two representatives to the General Assembly. Of these seventy-two, thirty-eight—or a majority—were apportioned to nineteen towns with an aggregate population of 30,818, among whom were 3,538 freemen, who cast 3,149 votes in the election of 1840. Thus the political power of the state, with 108,837 inhabitants, was controlled by 3,538 of their number, which was less than one-thirtieth of the population of the state, and one-seventh of those who under a purely "republican form of government," would be entitled to possess the political power of the state.

It must not be supposed that the people of Rhode Island failed to appreciate a republican form of government, and so long submitted to the domination of a favored class, under a royal charter from the King of England, because they did not believe the Declaration of Independence—"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights . . . that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*" They did believe that im-

mortal Declaration, and earnestly sought for a new constitution, more exactly conformed to that divine palladium of human rights.

As early as 1797 an effort was made to obtain such a constitution. In 1811 a bill to extend the elective franchise was introduced into the General Assembly, and passed the Senate, but was tabled in the House of Representatives. In 1820 a Convention met in Providence to consider the subject of extending suffrage. In 1824 another attempt was made to procure a written Constitution, an extension of suffrage, and an equalization of representation. A convention was called for that purpose; a constitution was formed and submitted to the land-owners and their eldest sons; but it was rejected, the clause for the extension of suffrage receiving only three votes. In 1829 a petition largely signed by reputable citizens was addressed to the legislature, but met with no favor. In 1832 another attempt was made to get a new constitution, but without success. In 1834 the legislature called a constitutional convention, *to be elected by land-holders and their eldest sons.* This act provides that any constitution which that convention might frame should be submitted for final adoption or rejection, not to the people or citizens at large, but to *"the land-holders and their eldest sons."* The convention assembled, but finally adjourned for want of a quorum. A proposition to extend the right of suffrage received only seven votes.

Then, when out of 22,674 adult male citizens, exclusive of aliens, lunatics, paupers, and convicts, and out of a population of 108,837, only 9,590 were allowed to have any hand or voice in the government under the royal charter; and when the disfranchised majority had for nearly half a century besought and begged the aristocratic minority for an extension of suffrage and for some equality of citizenship, humbly and patiently exhausting every available measure consistent with law and order, to obtain for themselves and their posterity a government of equal rights, without the remotest prospect of success, it finally resolved upon the *dernier ressort* of our forefathers.

This led to that memorable revolt called the "Dorr Rebellion," sometimes contemptuously spoken as a tempest in a teapot, on account of the comparative territorial insignificance of the state in which it took place, although it was really an event of momentous significance, deserving more prominence than has ever yet been given to it in the history of this country.

Rhode Island was the last of the original thirteen United States of America that came into the Union soon after the Revolution. She

adopted the constitution of the United States in 1790; but, without formally renouncing her allegiance to Great Britain, she continued her state Government under the royal charter granted by Charles II. in 1663. Between 1790 and the revolt in 1842 several attempts were made at different times, as already stated, to organize a republican form of government under a new constitution, after the model of some sister state in the Union. But these attempts were all frustrated by the privileged class in power.

In 1840 a society called the Rhode Island Suffrage Association was formed, which, in 1841, called a convention of the people to frame a constitution under which a government might be organized *de novo,* by the sovereign people, regardless of the existing oligarchy. Such a constitution was submitted to the people and formally adopted by a partial vote; the "law and order party," as the advocates of the charter government were styled, took no part in these proceedings, but repudiated the whole as a lawless insurrection; while the friends of universal suffrage were thus committed to the new constitution, as the supreme law of the state, under which they proceeded to organize a state government, and elected Thomas Wilson Dorr, governor.

In this way the vested government was brought into conflict with a powerful party of insurgents. Party lines were drawn all over the state, through neighborhoods, churches, and families, supplanting the amenities of social intercourse with hostilities of the bitterest animosity, breaking up the most sacred relations of society, and sundering the dearest ties of personal friendship. Husbands were set at variance with their wives, parents were made enemies of their own children, and children of the same blood were embittered against each other. And these enmities were intensified to the last degree by a marvelous conscientiousness.

Dorr had mustered a considerable force, with a somewhat imposing equipage. He had determined to take possession of the offices and property of the state by force, if he could not obtain them peaceably, and at first he no doubt supposed his men were heartily with him in that undertaking. On the other hand, the party in power was unyielding, martial law was proclaimed, the militia of the state were called out, and exempt citizens, including professors and students of Brown University (of whom I happened to be one), turned soldiers, and formed many volunteer companies, while a detachment of United States troops was sent to assist in quelling the insurrection. The Uni-

versity was closed; President Wayland preached on "Law and Order," to an immense congregation in the First Baptist Church, one of the ablest and most eloquent sermons from that master in the science of government, human and divine. The excitement throughout the state, especially in the city of Providence, was indescribable.

It became known that on a certain night Dorr intended to capture the state arsenal. When the time came, at midnight, no one was to be found in the streets, except policemen and soldiers. All at once the bells began to ring, rapidly at first, then chiming in a mournful, triple toll, responsive throughout the city—a preconcerted signal that Dorr was marching for the arsenal. A guard of 150 men, including Dorr's father, brother, and two uncles, was placed in the building, and a squad of sharpshooters in an ambush outside, under orders to shoot Dorr and his men the moment the first gun was fired at the arsenal. The insurgents were soon on the ground, and planted their guns within short range; the order to fire was given, but not obeyed. Attributing the disobedience of his men to a want of courage, Dorr himself seized and applied the torch, but the powder, which his gunners had wet, would not burn. His sagacious mind took in the plot; he commanded a retreat, and they went back to their camp. From that time Dorr understood that his officers and men, though willing to stand by him in defense of his government, would not take one step in arms against the party in power. It was this, unquestionably, that saved the state from the horrors of civil war.

The insurgents were awhile intrenched at Chepachet, a few miles from Providence; but in their first general engagement with the state forces there, they were signally defeated and dispersed. Dorr himself was arrested, tried for treason, condemned, and sentenced to hard labor in state prison for life. But after one year he was pardoned, and later the record of his sentence was legally expunged. It is worthy of note that, in less than six months after Dorr's defeat, a new constitution, submitted to the people by the General Assembly, was adopted by a vote almost unanimous.

No one will attempt to justify the Dorr rebellion, and yet no one I think can be found to approve the provocation that excited it.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

HENRY BURKE ROBINS

(The following article is one of a series of studies by representatives of different denominations made at the instance of the American Committee of the Conference on Faith and Order held last summer at Edinburgh.)

So far from discussing in detail the question of the origin and meaning of this particular phrase, the writer will direct his attention very early in the discussion to the attitude of Baptists toward fellow-Christians of other denominations. The reason for this procedure lies in the fact that Baptists throughout their history have set small store by creedal phraseology, even although they have greatly prized certain experiences which various creedal and confessional phrases have intended to express. In other words, their attitudes are not determined by the fact that a particular expression is or is not found in a particular ecclesiastical symbol. They are determined far more by the fact that such an emphasis is evidenced in the piety portrayed by the New Testament itself and the further fact that such an emphasis has come down through history in the stream of living evangelical faith, and has by its actual fruitage in life proven its significance.

That the somewhat archaic phraseology under consideration embodied an experience which was very real and precious to the community which first employed this form of words there need be no question; otherwise it could scarcely have found its place amid the sifted meanings preserved in the creeds. Yet to allow that there must have been a specific and precious meaning does not at once make it clear what that meaning was. The phrase, though it appears in the so-called Apostles' Creed, is probably not earlier in its appearance in that slowly forming symbol than the year 550 A. D. Baptists as such have no distinctive contribution to make to the historical interpretation of the Creed, but individual Baptist historians have made their contribution to the explication of that history. I shall content myself at this point with citing a recently published statement of my colleague, Dr. Conrad H. Moehlman, on the creedal phrase under consideration. Says Dr. Moehlman:

> " 'The communion of saints' is another very late Occidental addition to the Apostles' Creed. There is no agreement regarding its interpretation. One may choose from 'fellowship of holy persons,' 'fellowship of believers with each other,' 'congregation of the

saints,' 'communion of elect saints,' 'fellowship with saints and angels,' 'fellowship with the departed,' 'communion to be enjoyed in heaven after death,' 'fellowship in holy things,' 'sacramental communion.' Probably the author of this clause did not himself know what it meant. The North African Creed never recognized this affirmation. The freedom of the Christian may therefore be appealed to without penalty in this case." [1]

We shall dismiss this phase of the question without further comment, leaving further inquiry into the question to those good folk who imagine that the clearing up of this area may possibly or will assuredly make some contribution to the problem of Christian unity in our day. However, since the phrase "communion of saints" actually appears in the most widely circulated of Baptist "confessions," it may be in point to give some attention to its appearance in that connection. The inquiry, however, leads us to ask why Baptists, who quite generally have found it sufficient to declare the New Testament the only authoritative rule of faith and practice, should publish confessions at all. It is impossible, within the limits of this brief paper, to go deeply into that question. It has to be borne in mind that the century which saw the appearance of the first Baptist confessions was the century which produced the Thirty-nine Articles (as issued first by royal authority in 1628) and the Westminster Confession (1648). These are the standards issued by the dominant bodies in the religious world of Great Britain in that period. Minority bodies had a very difficult time in those days to carry on at all. It became important as a defensive measure for them to show their major agreements with the dominant bodies. Moreover, they could do this without self-stultification, for they belonged, as a matter of faith, to the main stream of evangelical piety, standing with the major bodies in matters of fundamental faith but differing in matters of ecclesiastical practice and in the spiritual implications of these practices. Protestantism was originally an attempt to effect a reform within the Roman Church, and when this end seemed impossible of attainment, the withdrawal was primarily on institutional rather than doctrinal grounds, although eventually the doctrinal basis of Christianity was also involved in the divergence from Rome. One can trace an

[1] Vide, *Colgate-Rochester Bulletin, March, 1936,* p. 200, Art. "About the Apostles' Creed." Vide, Ibid., *Journal of Religion,* January, 1922. Vide also, Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom,* II, pp. 52–55; McGiffert, *The Apostles' Creed,* etc. (New York, 1902); *Drown, The Apostles' Creed Today* (New York, 1917); the various encyclopaedia articles; etc., etc.

anology here between the relation of the major Protestant bodies to the Roman Church and the relation between Baptists and the major Protestant bodies. Protestants, Lutheran and Reformed, took over ecumenical Christianity from the Roman tradition. (We shall not here debate the relation of the Anglican Church to Romanism.) The Baptists, who differentiated themselves within the general Puritan and Nonconformist background, took over the general substance of seventeenth-century confessional Protestantism, particularly as embodied in the Thirty-nine Articles (which were more nearly the General Baptist position as to the substance of the faith) and the Westminster Confession, adopted as the basis of their own statements by the Particular Bapists, and thus thereafter most widely influential of the great Protestant confessions among Baptists.

One who places in parallel columns the articles on *Communion of Saints* in the Westminster Confession (1648) and the Particular Baptist Confession (1677) will at once be impressed by the close dependence of the latter upon the former. The language is slightly altered; certain phrases are omitted or brought into a different setting; but the family resemblance remains. No doubt the Baptists, who were a minority group, found it an excellent thing to be able to agree with so influential a body as the Westminster Assembly; but, equally, there is no doubt that the article embodied their hearty belief. It is in place here to cite the text of Article xxvii of the English Baptist Confession of 1689 (first published in 1677) for the reason that this particular Baptist Confession circulated very widely in Great Britain and, with two added articles, became the famous Philadelphia Confession, so extensively used in the United States. The text of Article xxvii is as follows:

> "1. All saints that are united to Jesus Christ their Head, by his Spirit and Faith; although they are not made thereby one person with him, have fellowship in his Graces, sufferings, death, resurrection and glory; and being united with one another in love, they have communion with each others gifts and graces; and obliged to the performance of such duties, publick and private, in an orderly way, as do conduce to their mutual good, both in the inward and outward man.
>
> "2. Saints by profession are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performance of such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edification; as also in relieving each other in outward things according to their several abilities, and necessities; which communion, according to

> the rule of the Gospel, ought specially to be exercised by them in the relations wherein they stand, whether in families or in churches; yet as God offereth opportunity is to be extended to all the household of faith, even all those who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus; nevertheless, their communion with one another as *Saints,* doth not take away nor infringe the title or property which each man hath in his goods and possessions." [2]

Notwithstanding the fact that Baptists published and extensively circulated confessions of faith, it should be borne in mind that these were never made the actual juridical basis of their church order and fellowship. And it should be noted also that certain of these confessions, as the New Hampshire Confession (1830), which had wide vogue in the northern part of the United States, have no article on "Communion of Saints." As E. T. Hiscox says:

> "Most (Baptist) churches have such summaries (Articles of Faith), and each church uses such form as it may prefer; or no form at all, if such be its choice. None are binding upon the conscience of any, and members are not required to subscribe to any." [3]

Because the content of confessions was so influenced by theological differences, one is more likely to find uniformly an article on the Perseverance of the Saints than on the Communion of Saints; and yet, among General Baptists, one would find the reverse the case. It is safe to say that Baptist churches at the present time hold a very free attitude toward these earlier confessions, and are even less interested to formulate or promulgate a uniform confession than they were at the time when the first Baptist confessions appeared. On the other hand, the Communion of Saints, in some proper sense, has been an ideal which Baptists quite generally have sought to realize.

Coupled with the question as to the Communion of Saints is an inquiry into Baptist belief in an Invisible Church. It is true that Baptist confessions have in time past had a good deal of reference, in relevant connections, to the Invisible Church. But they were no more original in this than in the matter of the Communion of Saints. This general idea of the distinction between the visible and the in-

[2] Vide McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* pp. 268 ff. In addition, on the general matters of Baptist history, vide, W. T. Whitley, *A Baptist Bibliography,* 2 vols. (London, 1916–22); ibid., *A History of the British Baptists* (London, 1923); A. H. Newman, *The Baptists* (New York, 1894).

[3] E. T. Hiscox, *The New Directory for Baptist Churches* (Philadelphia, 1894).

visible church was directly taken over by them from the great church confessions from which they so extensively borrowed. It was a point upon which they were not sensible of any divergence from their evangelical brethren. The Particular Baptist Confession (1677) followed by the Philadelphia Confession (1742) bases the first paragraph of its article xxvi ("Of the Church") rather closely upon the first paragraph of the Westminster Article dealing with the same subject; though in the remainder of its article it diverges more widely. This first paragraph, however, defines the Invisible Church. It is as follows:

> *"The Catholick or universal Church,* which (with respect to internal work of the Spirit, and truth of grace) may be called *invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all"* (Italics, indicating exact quotation from the Westminster Article, mine.)[4]

As has been said, one who studies this Article in the context of the evangelical confessions of the period discovers that the language which distinguishes an invisible from the visible church is not original to Baptists. So far as they are concerned, they are manifestly, in this regard, dependent upon general 17th century evangelical usage.

It will be sufficient for the purposes of this article, since Baptists do not determine their attitudes toward other followers of Christ mainly by the language of some confessional statement[5] or other, to show how this 17th century distinction between the visible and invisible church, and in particular the emphasis upon the idea that there is an Invisible Church, was perpetuated among Baptists in the late 19th century. I can do no better than to cite the teaching of the late Dr. A. H. Strong, perhaps the most influential Baptist theologian of his time, certainly in America. In his *Systematic Theology,*[6] very early in the section in which he deals with "Ecclesiology," Dr. Strong says of the Church:

> "The church of Christ, in its largest signification, is the whole company of regenerate persons, in all times and ages, in heaven and on earth. In this sense the church is identical with the spiritual

[4] Vide, McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* p. 264.
[5] Vide, Wayland, *Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches* (New York, 1857), pp. 13, 14; 85–87; Williams, *The Principles and Practices of Baptists,* (London, 1904), p. 65. Etc., etc.
[6] (New York, 6th Ed., 1899) p. 494 f.

> kingdom of God; both signify that redeemed humanity in which God in Christ exercises actual spiritual dominion. . . ."
>
> "The Scriptures, however, distinguish between this invisible or universal church, and the individual church, in which the universal church takes local and temporal form, and in which the idea of the church as a whole is concretely exhibited."

The "individual" church "in which the universal church takes local and temporal form" is further defined as

> "that smaller company of regenerate persons, who, in any given community, voluntarily unite themselves together for the purpose of securing the complete establishment of his kingdom in themselves and in the world."

The criterion which decides whether or not a body of believers is a true church or not is "Christ's laws." What are they? According to Dr. Strong, they may be summarized as follows:

> "The sufficiency and sole authority of the Scripture as the rule of doctrine and polity; credible evidence of regeneration and conversion as prerequisite to church membership; immersion only, as answering to Christ's command of baptism, and to the symbolic meaning of the ordinance; the order of the ordinances, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as of divine appointment, as well as the ordinances themselves; the right of each member of the church to a part in its government and discipline; each church, while holding fellowship with other churches, solely responsible to Christ; the freedom of the individual conscience, and the total independence of church and state."

These "laws of Christ" turn out to be another summary of "Baptist principles." One would, in Dr. Strong's opinion, have to say, if he measured existing bodies calling themselves Christian churches by these "laws," that "we cannot regard" most of them "as churches organized in all respects according to Christ's laws, or completely answering"—as Baptist churches do—"to the New Testament model of church organization." At the same time, he allows that, "in a somewhat loose and modified sense," we may call these other bodies churches.

There is no need of multiplying instances. This has been the "historic position" of most Baptist churches. It has widespread contemporary expression as the theoretic basis of the Baptist outlook, though it has to be acknowledged that in practice the attitude of Baptists toward those of other denominations and of Baptist churches toward other churches is by no means so rigid, in many sections of the world. How-

ever, we find authorities expressing themselves in our day in very similar terms. We may content ourselves with two citations: The first is an action taken by the Northern Baptist Convention, in 1919, in response to the overtures of an interdenominational Ad Interim Committee on Church Union. The reply was in part as follows:

> "In declining this invitation, however, Christian courtesy demands that the Northern Baptist Convention should state its position as to organic church union with other Christian denominations. This we make, not with any desire to pose as judges of our Christian brethren, but in the interest of mutual understanding.
>
> "The Baptist denomination is a collection of independent democratic churches. Not one of these churches recognizes any ecclesiastical authority superior to itself. They are grouped in associations, State Conventions, and a national Convention, but none of these groups has any control over a local church, beyond what lies in common faith, practice and service. The denomination, in so far as it is a unity, is a federation of independent democracies. In the nature of the case, therefore, anything like organic union of *Baptist* churches with other denominations is impossible. There is no centralized body that could deliver Baptist churches in any merger or corporate unity. If Baptist churches do not have organic unity among themselves, they obviously cannot have organic unity wtih other denominations. By the very nature of our organization, we are estopped from seeking organic union with other denominations." [7]

Only one of "Christ's laws" is here stressed, the independency of the local church. The second instance is more inclusive.

During the winter of 1935–1936 the President and Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance were in India. Upon leaving India in February, 1936, they prepared and communicated an address to the Baptist people in India, in which they said:

> "We do not forget the work of Christians of other names. We glorify God also in them. We have enjoyed association with many of these, and we pray that grace may be with them and with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Yet with deep conviction we hold that the simplicities of the Gospel of the New Testament, as Baptists seek to present it, have for our day and generation distinctive power and worth. Believers' baptism, by its emphasis on personal faith, has a spiritual and ethical significance which no alternative rite possesses; and its very form symbolizes and brings home the central truths and experiences of the Gospel

[7] Vide, *Annual of the Northern Baptist Convention,* 1919, pp. 228–230.

with unique power (Rom. vi. 4). Baptists take the universal priesthood of believers so seriously that they have no room for a sacerdotal order, and cannot permit any human caste or group to have dominion over their faith. Moreover, they are pioneers and advocates of spiritual and religious freedom, and would cease to be themselves and would fail their Lord if they abandoned their historic position. They recognize that in an imperfect world liberty involves perils and inconveniences, but hold that it is better to endure these than to sacrifice liberty itself. Christian unity is sometimes regarded as organic union—a shallow and misleading interpretation. "Unity" in this special sense is by some emphasized as if it were an absolute demand, and the merging of the various Christian communions a primary obligation. Baptists have not so learned Christ. They stress three great words—TRUTH, FREEDOM, UNITY; and they rank them in this order. Truth and freedom are foundation and precondition of any genuinely Christian unity; and to sacrifice either of these in the interests of external unification would be a lowering of the Christian standard. In thus writing, we know that we express the mind of our people the world over, and we are confident that you share this outlook and stand with them. They are ready at all times gladly to co-operate with fellow-Christians so far as there is agreement of conviction, but as trustees of an exceedingly precious heritage and members of a communion whose witness God has acknowledged in all the continents of earth, they dare not slight Him by ignoring or trifling with their stewardship. They would stand fast in the freedom with which Christ has made us free." [8]

These citations will indicate sufficiently the qualifications upon "the communion of saints" and complete mergence of the "body of Christ" which Baptists have felt and continue, very largely, to feel. No abstract principle of the Communion of Saints, no general endorsement of the ideal of an Invisible Church could do more than create a certain tension, sometimes distressing in its intensity, in relation to this problem. So long as Baptists believed that their faith and practice rested upon "laws" of Christ, they were bound to be pulled both ways: on the one hand, in the direction indicated by these laws; on the other hand, in the direction of more active fellowship with other Christians. That they have gone a long way in the direction of fellowship and practical co-operation scarcely needs argument. This is the real area in which

[8] The above is the principal of four paragraphs in the address "To the Members of the Baptist Communion in India" promulgated by George W. Truett and J. H. Rushbrook, for the Baptist World Alliance, Feb. 1st, 1936.

they have proved up on their ancient emphasis upon the Communion of Saints and have tested the reality of the Invisible Church.

Any one who is familiar with the struggles of Baptists with the Standing Order, in New England, will be the more impressed by their consistent emphasis upon toleration, or as one may better phrase it, upon religious liberty, in their Rhode Island colony, where they might, had they chosen, have pursued a very different policy. Liberty of conscience was something by which they set great store, and which with a good measure of consistency they extended to others. The point is that liberty of conscience supplies an atmosphere in which the spirit of "the Communion of Saints" can germinate and spring into being. And not a little of free church mutuality and good will on this continent is due to the general acceptance of this principle. But Baptists have done much more than seek to generate an atmosphere in which mutuality could flourish. It can be shown that, in their full proportion, they have had a share in promoting not only idealistic and philanthropic movements, but that in the more narrowly religious field also they have contributed to the achievement of comity, co-operation and unity of action. No attempt will be made here to outline this contribution; but anyone who cares to trace the development of those movements in which evangelical Christians sought conjointly to express their Christian faith and aspiration, will find the contribution of Baptists significant. This is true of the evangelistic movements of the last hundred years, of the foreign mission movement, of the rise of the Sunday School and the development of religious education, and of the various stages of the movement for church federation. Among the supporters of the American Sunday School Union at its inception was Rev. William Staughton, afterwards President of Columbia College, Washington, D. C., but at the time an influential Baptist pastor in Philadelphia.[9] At the meeting in 1893 out of which came the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, Baptists North and South were represented. H. A. Tupper, representing Southern Baptists, was a member of the first Business Committee of the Conference; H. C. Mabie, representing Northern Baptists, was a member of the Business Committee of the second annual meeting, and Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements of the third annual meeting.[10] At the organization meeting of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Rev. Rivington

[9] Vide, *The Sunday School Movement in America*, p. 64.
[10] Vide, *International Conf. of For. Miss. Bds.*, 1893.

D. Lord, a Baptist, acted as Recording Secretary, while President Harry Pratt Judson of the University of Chicago was a Vice President that same year (1909).[11] These are but illustrations of the fashion in which Baptists, from conviction, have entered into that co-operation which is the surest index of genuine Communion of Saints. With some notable exceptions, as for example the refusal of the Southern Baptist Convention to enter the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Baptists have been found supplying leadership and support in all major co-operative movements of Protestantism, at home and abroad. Where Baptists have held an insular or provincial attitude, they have not been alone in it. As with other Christian bodies, Baptist churches have moved at unequal rate out of their religious insularity and provincialism. They have moved out of it, moreover, for the same general reasons and under the same general influences which released the more progressive members of confessional bodies from its hold. All of them shared, though no doubt in varying measure, in what one may well term a change in the intellectual climate of evangelical religion—a broad cultural shift which during the last few decades has increasingly affected common thought in many aspects besides that of religion.

What, in the writer's judgment, is a very important consideration has been reserved for the last. It has to be understood that there is in process among Baptists, as with other Christian bodies, a liberalization of attitudes toward the past, a process which is destined to induce yet further changes in time to come. Baptists are not unique in this experience. The fact is that the general outlook of many within evangelical Christendom is slowly changing. Historical, critical, psychological, philosophical, and scientific studies are tending to put the process of the Christian religion through the centuries into a new perspective. The result is that not a few of the leaders and more highly educated members of certain Baptist churches, and here and there an entire congregation, without abating their reverence for the New Testament, have ceased to think of it as a codex, once for all settling matters of faith and practice. They have ceased to hold that Jesus enunciated ecclesiastical "laws", however willing to allow that the principles which are expressed or implied in his life and teaching penetrate to the core of all life and faith. They have come to look upon the New Testament as a transcript of a growing community of experience, reflecting in various sections, emphases and perspectives, the fresh and kindling

[11] Vide, First Annual Report, Federal Council of Churches, 1909.

sense of reality which discipleship to Jesus brought the first century Christian community. They have realized that the ecclesiastical order or orders, disclosed by the New Testament, represent initial and perhaps pragmatic attempts on the part of the Christian community to body forth in institutions the essentials of the new community life into which the first believers had come. They have come, in consequence, to hold that neither the Bible nor any epoch of the past lays down a final pattern by which the religious life must express itself. As a result, in their judgment, there is continually upon the churches the necessity, without breaking their connection with the past, of making the expression of their faith more adequately contemporary. In their understanding, there is no law which prevents Christians of today from moving in the direction of a common understanding of what is fruitful and expressive of our common faith and our common hopes. Such Baptists recognize, in varying measure, that the content of the faith itself changes, that not all those matters to which Christians of a past epoch gave their earnest attention need be matters of primary concern with us; that Christians of the creed-making and confession-writing centuries debated matters urgently related to the general milieu of their time, but perhaps of minor or secondary import, in any given instance, for today. These modern Baptists, whose number I do not attempt to estimate, with like-minded folk in other evangelical bodies, would incline to say accordingly that Christians of today are not bound by either the standards or the practices of another age, except in so far as these may be involved in an expression of the essential faith itself. They would not flout the past; they would recognize that the reality of our contemporary faith must be rendered to us in part through the alembic of the classic faith; they would make him about whom that classic faith was oriented himself the touchstone of its adequacy.

Why call attention to what is even yet a minority viewpoint? For the reason that, if Baptists generally, and other evangelical Christians generally, stood upon this platform, the whole question as to the next step toward an essentially organic and corporate expression of our common faith would be greatly simplified. The writer of this paper is no prophet, but would suggest in conclusion that it may be very much easier to juggle ancient phrases than to interpret what the Spirit saith unto the churches in this our day. The newer outlook which critical and historical scholarship tends to make a common possession in our time seems essential to any fundamental freedom from the legal-

isms which have bound all our ecclesiastical orthodoxies to a past which was once living and vibrant, but is now dead. No significant step toward organic union can be taken, in the writer's judgment, until some emancipating insight sets us free from our creedal prepossessions, from our crystallized attitudes toward the past. Organic union can have no spiritual significance except as it embodies a genuine ecumenical understanding of our faith. Baptists have been sensitive to the barrier which these attitudes in other impose, they have not always been so fully aware of the limitations implicit in their own attitudes and insistences. But neither Baptists nor any other body of Christians will be justified in moving away from what they have realized until a more inclusive and fundamental realization liberates them to do so. These liberating processes are slow of realization. Meanwhile, however, we can grow the spirit of mutuality and good will and can multiply the activities in which we stand shoulder to shoulder.

BOOKS OF INTEREST TO MINISTERS

An Introduction to the New Testament. Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937. Pp. x+302. $2.50.

Our mail from recent graduates often contains inquiries about this and that in the New Testament field, questions which are not answered in the heavy introductions, questions in which the average student of today is deeply interested but for which the answers in the class room have been too technical, questions asked at Christmas and at Easter. Formerly it was necessary to write many pages in reply, today we should begin by asking whether the inquirer had read the Lakes' *Introduction to the New Testament.*

The practical book on New Testament Introduction for busy ministers has appeared. It was designed for students in colleges and seminaries, for hard-pressed teachers whose students will no longer read heavy introductions but especially for the many young ministers who cannot understand their class notes on Introduction to the New Testament, who took it upon authority only promptly to forget it and now have not the time to look it up in ponderous tomes.

And surely any minister who is a graduate of a respectable seminary will not admit that he cannot follow what is popular with students of English 35 at Harvard University and with classes in Bible at Brown University. Just because these materials have been put to the test in the classroom are they so useful to the seminary graduate.

Criticism is here mixed with large doses of common sense; clarity accompanies brevity; freedom from dogmatic assumption or purpose is conspicuous; varying points of view are fairly presented and the student is never deceived into believing that much has been settled or can be settled. And the volume is up-to-date—look under form criticism, the Chester Beatty Papyrus, Son of Man, Elymas or Bar Jesus, pagan, doxology in Romans, for example. *The many who desire to know on what date Nisan 15 occurred in A. D. 30 have the answer on page 247.*

The study is really in three parts: 1. The Books of the New Testament, 185 pages; 2. The Background of the New Testament, about 56 pages; 3. Appendices, 52 pages.

Part I tells the story of authorship, content, date and so on in such a charming manner that one does not weary of it but finds it homiletically useful. Part II demonstrates conclusively that no New Testament class room need any longer give so many hours to background. What is necessary to know is here in less than sixty pages. The Appendices, in our judgment, are a constituent element of the discussion. How much time the busy minister loses searching for dates, list of high priests, names of Roman emperors, kings and procurators of Judea, the legates of Syria, the topography of the New Testament, and especially the main body of primitive Christian tradition. It is all conveniently arranged for immediate use here.

A well chosen list of problems, a selected bibliography and a general index help make this *Introduction* a very useful one for the minister. It is a book worth purchasing even upon the instalment plan.

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN.

David Joris: Wiedertäufer und Kämpfer für Toleranz Im 16. Jahrhundert. Roland H. Bainton. Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1937. Pp. viii+229. Rm. 9. Source documents. Bibliography. Index.

A well-documented original study of the life and significance of David Joris, Anabaptist and champion of toleration. This simply told story of a very adventurous and dramatic career of the sixteenth century might well attract the attention of any searching for historical materials for the screen. David Joris who had been an Anabaptist and mystic became a leader of the remnant of those that survived the Muenster catastrophe, a founder of the Mennonites. Persecuted and a fugitive in the Netherlands, he transformed himself into Johan von Brügge and settled with his large family in Basel. He lived and died there in honor but three years after his death, the inquisition wreaked vengeance upon his bones.

This study is of such primary significance to an appreciation of early Protestant spiritualism and Anabaptism that it appears as *Ergänzungsband VI* of the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* edited by Walter Friedensburg and Otto Scheel. Thus another American Church Historian has made the German hall of fame!

C. H. M.

Ethik; Der evangelische Weg der Verwirklichung des Guten. Alfred Dedo Mueller. Berlin: Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann, 1937. Pp. xiv+418. Rm. 8.50.

Volume 4 of *Die Theologie im Abrisz* edited by Professor Heinrich Frick of Marburg.

Professor Alfred Dedo Mueller of Leipzig has the honor of publishing the first German evangelical book on ethics which attempts to integrate contemporary problems of family, people, state, church and life with the requirements of Christian faith. Without surrendering theological postulates, the issues of contemporary life in Germany are faced in a realistic way. Ethics definitely becomes practical—a way of living in the actual world.

A good third of the study is devoted to orientation; the remainder grapples with the realization of ethical values, in personal and group relationships today. Marriage is interpreted not merely from the legal but from the biological and erotic points of view with special attention upon the status of the illegitimate child. Pacifism is repudiated, war is however only the *ultima ratio* of God and man; the Christian warrier must be a crusader; every war must be ethically judged; war may be engaged in only as final resort; new ways of preventing war must be discovered but the will to peace must not grow out of weakness, cowardice or loss of honor. Some very sobering questions are put to the church whose mission can be fulfilled only through the cross. If Christianity would survive, it must not only be concerned about existing issues, it must resolve the ethical bewilderment so characteristic of the membership of the Christian churches—it must lead. The inner life must be fused with a divine interpretation of the environment in which it participates. A very comprehensive analysis and synthesis of existing ethical problems.

C. H. M.

Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation. Peter Halman Monsma. Somerville, N. J.: Somerset Press, Inc., 1937. Pp. 218. $2.00.

If one can only be patient long enough, the investigation will appear which will settle in decisive fashion the problem at issue. Monsma's dissertation enables any minister to understand the origin, development and present status of Barthianism. In a very friendly, appreciative, sympathetic way the author demonstrates the inadequacies in the assumptions and conclusions "of a man whose sincerity, friendliness, and scholarly attainments he highly esteems."

The study consists of three parts: the origin and development of Barth's theology; his idea of revelation; findings: The historical section comprising the first half of the book is an essay in orientation of unusual merit, summarizing briefly the religious thought of such writers as Schlatter, Harnack, Herrmann, Troeltsch, Schweitzer and others. Barth's religious and theological development is critically traced from the cradle to the present time. Of the dozen German and Swiss theologians who are mentioned as influencing Barth in the course of the years, Herrmann, Blumhardt, Kutter, and Overbeck are correctly discerned to be the most significant; Kierkegaard and Dostoyefsky playing a far less important rôle. The documentation consists of over 430 supporting references and the bibliography is ample.

The two Barthian emphases singled out for specific criticism are his idea of the discontinuity between God and man and faith as something having independent validity. The latter is rejected because of its logical weaknesses, the variations traceable in Barth himself, Barth's own employment of the very processes of reasoning he repudiates, his personal concern over his argument, his acceptance of the Christian tradition, his unnatural interpretation of the Bible, his inability to explain Romans 1 and 2, and the indefinite, vague, obscure contents of the Barthian revelation.

Professors of preaching might warn their students against the Barthian homiletics:

> "No Anknüpfungspunkt in the auditors should be sought, whether in the introduction, the body, or the conclusion of a sermon, for such a procedure implies a misunderstanding of God's Word, that does not need man's art but finds its own entrance into the lives of men. Nor should a preacher regard the people he addresses as lost creatures, but he should simply preach the Word."

The proof-reading did not catch all the printer's errors, for example, Ertag p. 10, majestic p. 44, onself p. 59, abtsract p. 64, philisophy pp. 103, 105, writies p. 212, ethlics p. 217.

C. H. M.

A History of the Expansion of Christianity: Volume I. *The First Five Centuries* (to be completed in six volumes). Kenneth Scott Latourette. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937. Pp. xxiv+412. $3.50.

A rather ambitious project is *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* in six large volumes aggregating about a million words. The first volume

devoted to the first five centuries of Christianity has just appeared and it is hoped that the entire work may be available within seven years. The documentation is based on both primary and secondary materials. The extensive bibliographies are not only conveniently arranged but well annotated. The average reader will find the interpretation of the map difficult. The index is very far from adequate. For the chief value of this work to historians is its digest of the findings of scholars upon moot points and its source references but neither of these appears in the very abbreviated ten page index. Compare, for example, the index of Baron's "A Social and Religious History of the Jews," 840 pages of text and 100 pages of index! In Chapter I the works of Dill are quoted thirteen times; those of Case seven times; in Chapter III a single work of Harnack is referred to thirty-three times yet the index does not contain the names of Dill, Case, Harnack or the titles to their works. We suggest that the index of the succeeding volumes be greatly expanded to permit ready reference.

The author discusses the growth of Christianity from Jesus to the beginning of the conversion of the northern barbarians, emphasizing its content, successes and failures, manner of spread, and the interaction between Christianity and its environment. The point of view is Christian and the method mildly scientific.

C. H. M.

Christendom and Islam. W. Wilson Cash, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937. Pp. xiii+193. $2.00.

The Haskell Lectures delivered in the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, 1936–37. The secretary of the Church Missionary Society in London, formerly a missionary in the Moslem world, after studying Islam for more than thirty years, here records his conclusions regarding Islam, Christianity and the relations between the two. Islamic history is divided into seven periods: 1. Life of Mohammed, A. D. 570–632; 2. Eastward spread of Islam, A. D. 632–661; 3. The Omayyad rule at Damascus, A. D. 661–749; 4. The Abbaside rule at Bagdad, A. D. 749–1258; 5. The Ottoman rule to the defeat at Vienna, A. D. 1258–1583; 6. The Decline of Ottoman Turkey to the republic, A. D. 1683–1923; 7. Contemporary Turkey, since 1923. Lines of approach between the two religions proposed are through personal and spiritual experience, prayer, their common background, Judaism, and the character of Christ. A considerable correction of earlier orthodox Christian points of view is attempted. C. H. M.

Church and State in the Modern World. Henry Pitney Van Dusen, et al. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937. Pp. 231. $2.00.

Church and State. Ryllis A. Goslin. New York: Foreign Policy Association. Pp. 46. 35 cents.

The former is the sixth series on the Rauschenbusch Foundation of The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. A popular, somewhat disjointed, and at times too

vague presentation of a few of the problems in the relationship between church and state. It is deficient in historical perspective, orientation in American environment and because of theological assumptions. It contains important factual data but fails to set forth anything like an adequate constructive program to guide either church or state in the present conflict.

The latter is a very frank graphic sociological study of what has happened to the church in occidental culture since the World War with a German comparison between socialism and Christianity. C. H. M.

Ministers' Service Book. James D. Morrison. Willett Clark and Company, Chicago. 1937. Pp. xvi+268. $1.50.

A minister has no more important or difficult task than that of leading his congregation in worship. Accordingly, any help to that end he should eagerly welcome and utilize. This becomes all the more imperative in the absence of a prescribed liturgy. To all ministers, but especially to those in non-liturgical churches, this book brings effective reinforcement. It is just what its name suggests. There is no kind of service for which the minister will not find direction and helpful material. The author presents an extensive and varied selection from the rich liturgical treasures of the past, and in addition meets a need acutely felt in our time by presenting formulations of faith and purpose gathered from contemporary sources and consonant with the spirit of today. A discussion of the nature of worship in the introduction, and suggested orders of service will assist the minister to an intelligent use of the contents of the book, and will also perhaps stimulate his own originality in the conduct of worship. Mr. Morrison has further placed ministers in his debt by the admirable liturgical section which he has contributed to the New Church Hymnal recently published by the D. Appleton-Century Company. Of special value here are the responsive readings than which I know none better. J. F. V.

"The New Church Hymnal," just published by the D. Appleton-Century Company, answers a need long-felt by American churchmen and teachers of religion, namely, for a good, medium-sized, medium-priced, up-to-date hymnal, vitally inspiring for both private and public worship.

H. Augustine Smith, well-known editor of several editions of the "Hymnal for American Youth," "Hymns for the Living Age," etc., is the Editor-in-Chief, and he has undoubtedly achieved his finest work in this collection of hymns. He has had the able assistance of Edmund Shippen Barnes, Howard Chandler Robbins and James Dalton Morrison in this notable work.

Selection and arrangement of hymns, tunes and services are equally commendable as to convenience and attractiveness and utility for the church and the church school of the present day. An adequate number of the best among familiar hymns and tunes is found here as well as an excellent selection of European revivals and newer American hymns and tunes of unquestioned merit. Churchmen, searching for reality and for virility in liturgy and public worship, will welcome this splendid volume. G. L.

A History of Christian Worship. Oscar Hardman. Nashville, Tenn.: The Cokesbury Press, 1937. Pp. 263. $2.00.

Dr. Hardman, professor of Pastoral and Liturgical Theology in the University of London, has given us a remarkable book. It is only against the background of wide, exact, and sympathetic learning, that such a balanced survey of so broad a field can be made. The entire sweep of Christian history from the first century to the present is included. In each of the chapters, there is a discussion of,—1. A survey of the period; 2. The estates of men and their functions in worship; 3. Places of worship, and liturgical books and music; 4. Initiation and ecclesiastical description; 5. Corporate worship; 6. The hallowing of life; 7. Popular devotions. There is added a brief but competent bibliography. The Index is unusually good, and it needs to be, because so many terms and usages are rather unfamiliar to readers brought up in non-liturgical churches. By means of the Index, however, the inexperienced reader will find brief but adequate explanations of liturgical terms.

The publication of this book by the Cokesbury Press marks an epoch in the religious life of our time. The editors evidently believe that pastors and intelligent laymen in the so-called evangelical churches are needing and demanding a treatment like this; and in this belief the reviewer concurs. Our times are showing a deepening interest in the worship phase of church life, and this author will enable us to set up our enrichment programs in view of the rich traditions of the Christian centuries. And, further, for those who may wish to do further study in this fascinating realm, this discussion will furnish a splendid guide.

Perhaps one should add that the point of view is that of the Anglican Church, which, however, the author neither attempts to cover up nor to force upon the reader.

F. O. E.

The Man That Changed the World. Frederick B. Fisher. Nashville, Tenn.: The Cokesbury Press, 1937. Pp. 208. $2.00.

In taking up a new study of Jesus, one wonders what new approach will make the book a genuine contribution. Dr. Fisher, as a former missionary and keen student of Eastern religions, calls attention in a fresh and vital way to the interpenetration of all religions in the Graeco-Roman world. He helps us to see the Master in a larger milieu than usual, by placing him in the center of that throbbing life, reflecting to some degree the far East as well as the nearer East. At the same time, he avoids the danger of making Christianity simply another syncretistic type of religion. The Christ of this book is a splendid creative figure, with a message distinctively his own, a message as greatly needed today as in the first century. Further, in the last two chapters, "The World That Is Being Made by Him," and "The Soul That Finds Itself in Him," the author in his usual incisive way, indicates the present values of the Christian faith. The canvas is large, the Christ is magnetic and strong, the challenge is forceful.

F. O. E.

Stocking Tales. Jay T. Stocking. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1937. Pp. 119. $1.25.

Dr. Stocking was eminent in many ways, but his congregations are likely to remember him fully as much for his sermonettes and stories to children as for any other activity of his fruitful ministry. Dr. Blanchard, editor of this charming book of stories, declares: "The love of the children was one of the things that pleased him most, and the things he could do for them satisfied him as hardly anything else ever did." There is a fancifulness and an informality about these stories that will charm the children and the childlike of every age. Some of these could be told as they are, but, as the editor intimates, the personality of the teller was an essential part of the original procedure. Certain it is that this is a book that children will read and prize, and be the better for so doing.

F. O. E.

How to Lead a Bible School. W. Edward Raffety. Cincinnati Ohio: The Standard Publishing Co., 1936. Pp. 182. $1.25.

Every pastor and religious educator is on the lookout for books that the laymen in our churches will read and benefit from. Dr. Raffety, out of a wonderfully rich experience, both academic, technical, and practical, presents us with such a book. There is a sparkle about the book which his friends associate with a twinkle in his eye. Common sense is a keynote of the volume. Virtually all the important topics which one looks for in a good book on church school organization and administration are discussed and illuminated. Dr. Raffety, a graduate of the Rochester Theological Seminary, 1903, has occupied so many positions of high responsibility that we must refer our readers to "Who's Who" for the more important. This book gathers up the mature reflections of successful leadership in the church school.

F. O. E.

The Modern Church School Series: Units 7, 8 and 9. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1937. Each unit, 30 cents.

This series of pamphlets consists of study units based on experiments in informal teaching. They provide for longer sessions, flexible informality, and community expeditions and activities.

Jeanette E. Perkins has written Unit No. 7, "While the Earth Remaineth," a springtime unit on change and continuing life. The pamphlet describes six Primary services of worship for the Easter Season.

Margaret Dulles Edwards is the author of No. 8, "Easter," a Junior unit of work.

Number 9 consists of four units of work for Juniors on the problems of peace and war, each by a different writer. The title is "Changing Swords into Plowshares."

These booklets offer to progressive leaders in our church schools adequate guidance in the newer type of material. They have all been tried out and found successful.

F. O. E.